

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horbach (US 3,668,586) in view of Ishiwaki (US 5,847,518).

Claims 11-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horbach in view of Ishiwaki and Kawano et al. (US 5,736,917).

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants have amended claims 10 and 14 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 10-17 are pending for consideration.

**All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horbach (US 3,668,586) in view of Ishiwaki (US 5,847,518), and claims 11-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horbach in view of Ishiwaki and Kawano et al. (US 5,736,917). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the following reasons.

Independent claims 10 and 14, as amended, both recite a transformer for driving a lamp of a liquid crystal display including a bobbin having “a pair of lead pins each extending from opposing ends of the bobbin along opposing directions parallel to a length of the bobbin.” In contrast to Applicants’ claimed invention, Horbach explicitly teaches (FIGs. 1 and 2) pairs of leads 16 extending from a single common end of the bobbin 14, and Ishiwaki teaches leads extending from opposing ends of the bobbin, but along a direction perpendicular to a length of the bobbin. Moreover, Kawano et al. is completely silent with respect to lead pins extending from opposing ends of the bobbin, let alone lead pins extending along a direction parallel to a

length of the bobbin. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that none of Horbach, Ishiwaki, and Kawano et al., whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest every feature of independent claims 10 and 14, and hence dependent claims 11-13 and 15-17.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn because the applied art does not teach or suggest the novel combination of features recited in amended independent claims 10 and 14, and hence dependent claims 11-13 and 15-17.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendment and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under


37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

Dated: July 11, 2005

By: \_\_\_\_\_



David B. Hardy  
Reg. No. 47,362

**CUSTOMER NO. 09629**  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: (202) 739-3000